

05/01/2006

**California Redevelopment Agencies**  
**INCREASE IN INCLUSIONARY OBLIGATION FROM APPLICABLE UNITS**  
**PRODUCED IN PROJECT AREAS DURING THE REPORTING YEAR**

**Exhibit G**  
**Page 1 of 9**

	<b>PART I</b>					<b>PART II</b>					<b>PART III</b>	
	<b>[H&amp;SC Section 33413(b)(1)]</b>					<b>[H&amp;SC Section 33413(b)(2)]</b>					<b>TOTALS</b>	
	----- <b>AGENCY DEVELOPED</b> -----					----- <b>NONAGENCY DEVELOPED</b> -----					----- <b>TOTALS</b> -----	
	1. New Units	2. Sub. Rehab	3. Sum #1+#2	4. Incl Ob #3 x 30%	5. Very-Low #4 x 50%	6. New Units	7. Sub. Rehab.	8. Sum #6+#7	9. Incl. Ob. #8 x 15%	10. VLow #9x 40%	11. Sum #4+#9*	12. VLow #5+#10
<b>ALAMEDA COUNTY</b>												
ALAMEDA CITY CIC						12		12	2	1	2	1
EMERYVILLE RDA						22		22	3	1	3	1
FREMONT RDA	18		18	5	3						5	3
HAYWARD RDA						50		50	8	3	8	3
LIVERMORE RDA	103		103	31	15						31	15
OAKLAND RDA						214	34	248	37	15	37	15
County Totals:	121		121	36	18	298	34	332	50	20	86	38
<b>BUTTE COUNTY</b>												
OROVILLE RDA	8		8	2	1						2	1
County Totals:	8		8	2	1						2	1
<b>CONTRA COSTA COUNTY</b>												
BRENTWOOD RDA						9		9	1	1	1	1
CONTRA COSTA COUNTY RDA												
HERCULES RDA						12		12	2	1	2	1
OAKLEY						9		9	1	1	1	1
PITTSBURG RDA						287		287	43	17	43	17
PLEASANT HILL RDA												
RICHMOND RDA						77		77	12	5	12	5
SAN RAMON RDA						10		10	2	1	2	1
County Totals:						404		404	61	24	61	24
<b>Fresno COUNTY</b>												
CLOVIS CDA	10		10	3	2						3	2
FRESNO CITY RDA						4	3	7	1	0	1	0

**NOTES**

- \* Data is a summary of totals of all project areas' new construction and substantial rehabilitation (Post 1993) units from forms HCD-D2 through HCD-D7 (Appendix B) developed by any entity (agency or non-agency).
- \* Totals may be impacted by rounding.
- \* Requirements for Part I and II differ. Part I Agency Developed: Inclusionary is 30% with Very-Low of 50% of total. Part II Nonagency Developed: Inclusionary is 15% with Very-Low of 40% of total.
- \* Part III #12 is a subset of #11.

05/01/2006

**California Redevelopment Agencies**  
**INCREASE IN INCLUSIONARY OBLIGATION FROM APPLICABLE UNITS**  
**PRODUCED IN PROJECT AREAS DURING THE REPORTING YEAR**

**Exhibit G**  
**Page 2 of 9**

		<b>PART I</b> [H&SC Section 33413(b)(1)]					<b>PART II</b> [H&SC Section 33413(b)(2)]					<b>PART III</b> -----TOTALS-----	
		-----AGENCY DEVELOPED-----					-----NONAGENCY DEVELOPED-----						
		1. New Units	2. Sub. Rehab	3. Sum #1+#2	4. Incl Ob #3 x 30%	5. Very-Low #4 x 50%	6. New Units	7. Sub. Rehab.	8. Sum #6+#7	9. Incl. Ob. #8 x 15%	10. VLow #9x 40%	11. Sum #4+#9*	12. VLow #5+#10
<b>ORANGE COVE RDA</b>													
<b>PARLIER RDA</b>													
	<b>County Totals:</b>	<b>10</b>		<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>HUMBOLDT COUNTY</b>													
<b>ARCATA CDA</b>							64		64	10	4	10	4
<b>EUREKA RDA</b>		75		75	23	11						23	11
	<b>County Totals:</b>	<b>75</b>		<b>75</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>64</b>		<b>64</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>KERN COUNTY</b>													
<b>BAKERSFIELD RDA</b>		180		180	54	27	21		21	3	1	57	28
<b>CALIFORNIA CITY RDA</b>													
<b>TAFT COMMUNITY DA</b>		2	1	3	1	0	4		4	1	0	2	1
	<b>County Totals:</b>	<b>182</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>25</b>		<b>25</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>KINGS COUNTY</b>													
<b>CORCORAN RDA</b>								1	1	0	0	0	0
	<b>County Totals:</b>							<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>LOS ANGELES COUNTY</b>													
<b>AGOURA HILLS RDA</b>													
<b>AZUSA RDA</b>													
<b>BELLFLOWER CRA</b>													
<b>BURBANK RDA</b>							141		141	21	8	21	8
<b>CLAREMONT RDA</b>		6		6	2	1						2	1
<b>HUNTINGTON PARK RDA</b>		7		7	2	1						2	1
<b>LANCASTER RDA</b>							76		76	11	5	11	5
<b>LONG BEACH RDA</b>							41	20	61	9	4	9	4

**NOTES**

- \* Data is a summary of totals of all project areas' new construction and substantial rehabilitation (Post 1993) units from forms HCD-D2 through HCD-D7 (Appendix B) developed by any entity (agency or non-agency).
- \* Totals may be impacted by rounding.
- \* Requirements for Part I and II differ. Part I Agency Developed: Inclusionary is 30% with Very-Low of 50% of total. Part II Nonagency Developed: Inclusionary is 15% with Very-Low of 40% of total.
- \* Part III #12 is a subset of #11.

05/01/2006

**California Redevelopment Agencies**  
**INCREASE IN INCLUSIONARY OBLIGATION FROM APPLICABLE UNITS**  
**PRODUCED IN PROJECT AREAS DURING THE REPORTING YEAR**

**Exhibit G**  
**Page 3 of 9**

	<b>PART I</b>					<b>PART II</b>					<b>PART III</b>	
	<b>[H&amp;SC Section 33413(b)(1)]</b>					<b>[H&amp;SC Section 33413(b)(2)]</b>					<b>TOTALS</b>	
	<b>-----AGENCY DEVELOPED-----</b>					<b>-----NONAGENCY DEVELOPED-----</b>					<b>-----TOTALS-----</b>	
	1. New Units	2. Sub. Rehab	3. Sum #1+#2	4. Incl Ob #3 x 30%	5. Very-Low #4 x 50%	6. New Units	7. Sub. Rehab.	8. Sum #6+#7	9. Incl. Ob. #8 x 15%	10. VLow #9x 40%	11. Sum #4+#9*	12. VLow #5+#10
LOS ANGELES CITY CRA						174		174	26	10	26	10
MONROVIA RDA	1		1	0	0						0	0
POMONA RDA												
SAN FERNANDO RDA	99		99	30	15						30	15
SANTA MONICA RDA						26	6	32	5	2	5	2
WALNUT IMPROVEMENT AGENCY						108		108	16	6	16	6
WEST COVINA						85		85	13	5	13	5
WEST HOLLYWOOD RDA												
County Totals:	<b>113</b>		<b>113</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>651</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>677</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>58</b>
MADERA COUNTY												
MADERA RDA	57		57	17	9						17	9
County Totals:	<b>57</b>		<b>57</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>9</b>						<b>17</b>	<b>9</b>
MARIN COUNTY												
NOVATO RDA						190		190	29	11	29	11
County Totals:						<b>190</b>		<b>190</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>11</b>
MERCED COUNTY												
ATWATER RDA							3	3	0	0	0	0
LOS BANOS												
MERCED CITY RDA	213		213	64	32						64	32
County Totals:	<b>213</b>		<b>213</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>32</b>		<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>32</b>
MONTEREY COUNTY												
GONZALES RDA												
MONTEREY COUNTY CDA						22		22	3	1	3	1
SALINAS RDA						80		80	12	5	12	5

**NOTES**

- \* Data is a summary of totals of all project areas' new construction and substantial rehabilitation (Post 1993) units from forms HCD-D2 through HCD-D7 (Appendix B) developed by any entity (agency or non-agency).
- \* Totals may be impacted by rounding.
- \* Requirements for Part I and II differ. Part I Agency Developed: Inclusionary is 30% with Very-Low of 50% of total. Part II Nonagency Developed: Inclusionary is 15% with Very-Low of 40% of total.
- \* Part III #12 is a subset of #11.

05/01/2006

**California Redevelopment Agencies**  
**INCREASE IN INCLUSIONARY OBLIGATION FROM APPLICABLE UNITS**  
**PRODUCED IN PROJECT AREAS DURING THE REPORTING YEAR**

**Exhibit G**  
**Page 4 of 9**

	<b>PART I</b>					<b>PART II</b>					<b>PART III</b>	
	<b>[H&amp;SC Section 33413(b)(1)]</b>					<b>[H&amp;SC Section 33413(b)(2)]</b>					<b>TOTALS</b>	
	1. New Units	2. Sub. Rehab	3. Sum #1+#2	4. Incl Ob #3 x 30%	5. Very-Low #4 x 50%	6. New Units	7. Sub. Rehab.	8. Sum #6+#7	9. Incl. Ob. #8 x 15%	10. VLow #9x 40%	11. Sum #4+#9*	12. VLow #5+#10
SEASIDE RDA	12		12	4	2						4	2
County Totals:	12		12	4	2	102		102	15	6	19	8
NEVADA COUNTY												
GRASS VALLEY RDA						1		1	0	0	0	0
County Totals:						1		1	0	0	0	0
ORANGE COUNTY												
ANAHEIM RDA	51		51	15	8						15	8
BUENA PARK RDA												
CYPRESS RDA						5		5	1	0	1	0
HUNTINGTON BEACH RDA						82		82	12	5	12	5
ORANGE COUNTY RDA	30		30	9	5						9	5
PLACENTIA RDA						4		4	1	0	1	0
SANTA ANA CRA						6		6	1	0	1	0
STANTON RDA						18		18	3	1	3	1
TUSTIN COMMUNITY RDA						78		78	12	5	12	5
YORBA LINDA RDA						100		100	15	6	15	6
County Totals:	81		81	24	12	293		293	44	18	68	30
PLACER COUNTY												
PLACER COUNTY RDA												
County Totals:												
RIVERSIDE COUNTY												
CATHEDRAL CITY RDA						1	5	6	1	0	1	0
COACHELLA RDA						127		127	19	8	19	8
LA QUINTA RDA							10	10	2	1	2	1

**NOTES**

- \* Data is a summary of totals of all project areas' new construction and substantial rehabilitation (Post 1993) units from forms HCD-D2 through HCD-D7 (Appendix B) developed by any entity (agency or non-agency).
- \* Totals may be impacted by rounding.
- \* Requirements for Part I and II differ. Part I Agency Developed: Inclusionary is 30% with Very-Low of 50% of total. Part II Nonagency Developed: Inclusionary is 15% with Very-Low of 40% of total.
- \* Part III #12 is a subset of #11.

05/01/2006

**California Redevelopment Agencies**  
**INCREASE IN INCLUSIONARY OBLIGATION FROM APPLICABLE UNITS**  
**PRODUCED IN PROJECT AREAS DURING THE REPORTING YEAR**

**Exhibit G**  
**Page 5 of 9**

	<b>PART I</b>					<b>PART II</b>					<b>PART III</b>	
	<b>[H&amp;SC Section 33413(b)(1)]</b>					<b>[H&amp;SC Section 33413(b)(2)]</b>					<b>TOTALS</b>	
	<b>-----AGENCY DEVELOPED-----</b>					<b>-----NONAGENCY DEVELOPED-----</b>					<b>-----TOTALS-----</b>	
	1. New Units	2. Sub. Rehab	3. Sum #1+#2	4. Incl Ob #3 x 30%	5. Very-Low #4 x 50%	6. New Units	7. Sub. Rehab.	8. Sum #6+#7	9. Incl. Ob. #8 x 15%	10. VLow #9x 40%	11. Sum #4+#9*	12. VLow #5+#10
<b>MURRIETA RDA</b>						64		64	10	4	10	4
<b>PALM DESERT RDA</b>						183		183	27	11	27	11
<b>RANCHO MIRAGE RDA</b>						21		21	3	1	3	1
<b>RIVERSIDE COUNTY RDA</b>	216		216	65	32	163		163	24	10	89	42
<b>RIVERSIDE RDA</b>						41		41	6	2	6	2
<b>TEMECULA RDA</b>						66		66	10	4	10	4
<b>County Totals:</b>	<b>216</b>		<b>216</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>666</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>681</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>SACRAMENTO COUNTY</b>												
<b>SACRAMENTO CITY RDA</b>						276		276	41	17	41	17
<b>SACRAMENTO COUNTY RDA</b>						93		93	14	6	14	6
<b>County Totals:</b>						<b>369</b>		<b>369</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>SAN BENITO COUNTY</b>												
<b>HOLLISTER RDA</b>	11		11	3	2						3	2
<b>County Totals:</b>	<b>11</b>		<b>11</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>						<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY</b>												
<b>CHINO RDA</b>						1	1	2	0	0	0	0
<b>COLTON RDA</b>	4	14	18	5	3						5	3
<b>FONTANA RDA</b>	186		186	56	28						56	28
<b>GRAND TERRACE RDA</b>						2		2	0	0	0	0
<b>HIGHLAND RDA</b>						10		10	2	1	2	1
<b>RANCHO CUCAMONGA RDA</b>												
<b>RIALTO RDA</b>												
<b>VICTORVILLE RDA</b>						8		8	1	0	1	0
<b>County Totals:</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>32</b>

**NOTES**

- \* Data is a summary of totals of all project areas' new construction and substantial rehabilitation (Post 1993) units from forms HCD-D2 through HCD-D7 (Appendix B) developed by any entity (agency or non-agency).
- \* Totals may be impacted by rounding.
- \* Requirements for Part I and II differ. Part I Agency Developed: Inclusionary is 30% with Very-Low of 50% of total. Part II Nonagency Developed: Inclusionary is 15% with Very-Low of 40% of total.
- \* Part III #12 is a subset of #11.

05/01/2006

**California Redevelopment Agencies**  
**INCREASE IN INCLUSIONARY OBLIGATION FROM APPLICABLE UNITS**  
**PRODUCED IN PROJECT AREAS DURING THE REPORTING YEAR**

**Exhibit G**  
**Page 6 of 9**

	<b>PART I</b>					<b>PART II</b>					<b>PART III</b>	
	<b>[H&amp;SC Section 33413(b)(1)]</b>					<b>[H&amp;SC Section 33413(b)(2)]</b>					<b>TOTALS</b>	
	<b>-----AGENCY DEVELOPED-----</b>					<b>-----NONAGENCY DEVELOPED-----</b>					<b>-----TOTALS-----</b>	
	1. New Units	2. Sub. Rehab	3. Sum #1+#2	4. Incl Ob #3 x 30%	5. Very-Low #4 x 50%	6. New Units	7. Sub. Rehab.	8. Sum #6+#7	9. Incl. Ob. #8 x 15%	10. VLow #9x 40%	11. Sum #4+#9*	12. VLow #5+#10
<b>SAN DIEGO COUNTY</b>												
<b>CARLSBAD RDA</b>												
<b>CHULA VISTA RDA</b>						80		80	12	5	12	5
<b>EL CAJON RDA</b>												
<b>ESCONDIDO CDC</b>						142		142	21	9	21	9
<b>POWAY RDA</b>												
<b>SAN DIEGO CITY RDA</b>	142		142	43	21	71		71	11	4	53	26
<b>SAN MARCOS RDA</b>	155		155	47	23						47	23
<b>SANTEE RDA</b>						133		133	20	8	20	8
<b>County Totals:</b>	<b>297</b>		<b>297</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>426</b>		<b>426</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY</b>												
<b>STOCKTON RDA</b>							310	310	47	19	47	19
<b>County Totals:</b>							<b>310</b>	<b>310</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY</b>												
<b>ATASCADERO RDA</b>												
<b>EL PASO ROBES RDA</b>												
<b>County Totals:</b>												
<b>SAN MATEO COUNTY</b>												
<b>MENLO PARK CDA</b>												
<b>SAN BRUNO RDA</b>						60		60	9	4	9	4
<b>County Totals:</b>						<b>60</b>		<b>60</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>SANTA BARBARA COUNTY</b>												
<b>LOMPOC RDA</b>		12	12	4	2	39		39	6	2	9	4
<b>SANTA BARBARA RDA</b>												
<b>County Totals:</b>		<b>12</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>39</b>		<b>39</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4</b>

**NOTES**

- \* Data is a summary of totals of all project areas' new construction and substantial rehabilitation (Post 1993) units from forms HCD-D2 through HCD-D7 (Appendix B) developed by any entity (agency or non-agency).
- \* Totals may be impacted by rounding.
- \* Requirements for Part I and II differ. Part I Agency Developed: Inclusionary is 30% with Very-Low of 50% of total. Part II Nonagency Developed: Inclusionary is 15% with Very-Low of 40% of total.
- \* Part III #12 is a subset of #11.

05/01/2006

**California Redevelopment Agencies**  
**INCREASE IN INCLUSIONARY OBLIGATION FROM APPLICABLE UNITS**  
**PRODUCED IN PROJECT AREAS DURING THE REPORTING YEAR**

**Exhibit G**  
**Page 7 of 9**

	<b>PART I</b>					<b>PART II</b>					<b>PART III</b>	
	<b>[H&amp;SC Section 33413(b)(1)]</b>					<b>[H&amp;SC Section 33413(b)(2)]</b>					<b>TOTALS</b>	
	<b>-----AGENCY DEVELOPED-----</b>					<b>-----NONAGENCY DEVELOPED-----</b>					<b>-----TOTALS-----</b>	
	1. New Units	2. Sub. Rehab	3. Sum #1+#2	4. Incl Ob #3 x 30%	5. Very-Low #4 x 50%	6. New Units	7. Sub. Rehab.	8. Sum #6+#7	9. Incl. Ob. #8 x 15%	10. VLow #9x 40%	11. Sum #4+#9*	12. VLow #5+#10
<b>SANTA CLARA COUNTY</b>												
<b>CAMPBELL RDA</b>	3		3	1	0						1	0
<b>MORGAN HILL RDA</b>						110		110	17	7	17	7
<b>SAN JOSE RDA</b>						1,102	174	1,276	191	77	191	77
<b>County Totals:</b>	<b>3</b>		<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,212</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>1,386</b>	<b>208</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>84</b>
<b>SANTA CRUZ COUNTY</b>												
<b>SANTA CRUZ COUNTY RDA</b>						5		5	1	0	1	0
<b>SCOTTS VALLEY RDA</b>						2		2	0	0	0	0
<b>WATSONVILLE RDA</b>						1		1	0	0	0	0
<b>County Totals:</b>						<b>8</b>		<b>8</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>SHASTA COUNTY</b>												
<b>REDDING RDA</b>	2		2	1	0	64	11	75	11	5	12	5
<b>SHASTA LAKE</b>		4	4	1	1						1	1
<b>County Totals:</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>SOLANO COUNTY</b>												
<b>FAIRFIELD RDA</b>						34	24	58	9	3	9	3
<b>SUISUN CITY RDA</b>												
<b>VACAVILLE RDA</b>						90		90	14	5	14	5
<b>County Totals:</b>						<b>124</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Sonoma COUNTY</b>												
<b>CLOVERDALE RDA</b>												
<b>HEALDSBURG RDA</b>						17		17	3	1	3	1
<b>PETALUMA CDC</b>	102		102	31	15						31	15
<b>ROHNERT PARK RDA</b>						43		43	6	3	6	3

**NOTES**

- \* Data is a summary of totals of all project areas' new construction and substantial rehabilitation (Post 1993) units from forms HCD-D2 through HCD-D7 (Appendix B) developed by any entity (agency or non-agency).
- \* Totals may be impacted by rounding.
- \* Requirements for Part I and II differ. Part I Agency Developed: Inclusionary is 30% with Very-Low of 50% of total. Part II Nonagency Developed: Inclusionary is 15% with Very-Low of 40% of total.
- \* Part III #12 is a subset of #11.

05/01/2006

**California Redevelopment Agencies**  
**INCREASE IN INCLUSIONARY OBLIGATION FROM APPLICABLE UNITS**  
**PRODUCED IN PROJECT AREAS DURING THE REPORTING YEAR**

**Exhibit G**  
**Page 8 of 9**

	<b>PART I</b>					<b>PART II</b>					<b>PART III</b>	
	<b>[H&amp;SC Section 33413(b)(1)]</b>					<b>[H&amp;SC Section 33413(b)(2)]</b>					<b>TOTALS</b>	
	<b>-----AGENCY DEVELOPED-----</b>					<b>-----NONAGENCY DEVELOPED-----</b>					<b>-----TOTALS-----</b>	
	1. New Units	2. Sub. Rehab	3. Sum #1+#2	4. Incl Ob #3 x 30%	5. Very-Low #4 x 50%	6. New Units	7. Sub. Rehab.	8. Sum #6+#7	9. Incl. Ob. #8 x 15%	10. VLow #9x 40%	11. Sum #4+#9*	12. VLow #5+#10
SANTA ROSA												
SEBASTOPOL RDA												
SONOMA CDA						7		7	1	0	1	0
County Totals:	102		102	31	15	67		67	10	4	41	19
STANISLAUS COUNTY												
STANISLAUS COUNTY RDA												
County Totals:												
TULARE COUNTY												
PORTERVILLE RDA						57		57	9	3	9	3
VISALIA CRA												
WOODLAKE RDA												
County Totals:						57		57	9	3	9	3
TUOLUMNE COUNTY												
SONORA RDA												
County Totals:												
VENTURA COUNTY												
MOORPARK RDA												
OXNARD RDA						72		72	11	4	11	4
PORT HUENEME RDA												
SIMI VALLEY CDA	86		86	26	13	90		90	14	5	39	18
THOUSAND OAKS RDA						57		57	9	3	9	3
County Totals:	86		86	26	13	219		219	33	13	59	26
YOLO COUNTY												
WEST SACRAMENTO RDA						192		192	29	12	29	12
County Totals:						192		192	29	12	29	12

**NOTES**

- \* Data is a summary of totals of all project areas' new construction and substantial rehabilitation (Post 1993) units from forms HCD-D2 through HCD-D7 (Appendix B) developed by any entity (agency or non-agency).
- \* Totals may be impacted by rounding.
- \* Requirements for Part I and II differ. Part I Agency Developed: Inclusionary is 30% with Very-Low of 50% of total. Part II Nonagency Developed: Inclusionary is 15% with Very-Low of 40% of total.
- \* Part III #12 is a subset of #11.

05/01/2006

**California Redevelopment Agencies**  
**INCREASE IN INCLUSIONARY OBLIGATION FROM APPLICABLE UNITS**  
**PRODUCED IN PROJECT AREAS DURING THE REPORTING YEAR**

**Exhibit G**  
**Page 9 of 9**

	<b>PART I</b>					<b>PART II</b>					<b>PART III</b>	
	<b>[H&amp;SC Section 33413(b)(1)]</b>					<b>[H&amp;SC Section 33413(b)(2)]</b>					<b>-----TOTALS-----</b>	
	<b>-----AGENCY DEVELOPED-----</b>					<b>-----NONAGENCY DEVELOPED-----</b>					<b>-----TOTALS-----</b>	
	1. New Units	2. Sub. Rehab	3. Sum #1+#2	4. Incl Ob #3 x 30%	5. Very-Low #4 x 50%	6. New Units	7. Sub. Rehab.	8. Sum #6+#7	9. Incl. Ob. #8 x 15%	10. VLow #9x 40%	11. Sum #4+#9*	12. VLow #5+#10
Total Agencies Contributing to this Report: 126	<b>1,779</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>1,810</b>	<b>543</b>	<b>272</b>	<b>5,556</b>	<b>602</b>	<b>6,158</b>	<b>924</b>	<b>369</b>	<b>1,467</b>	<b>641</b>

**NOTES**

- \* Data is a summary of totals of all project areas' new construction and substantial rehabilitation (Post 1993) units from forms HCD-D2 through HCD-D7 (Appendix B) developed by any entity (agency or non-agency).
- \* Totals may be impacted by rounding.
- \* Requirements for Part I and II differ. Part I Agency Developed: Inclusionary is 30% with Very-Low of 50% of total. Part II Nonagency Developed: Inclusionary is 15% with Very-Low of 40% of total.
- \* Part III #12 is a subset of #11.